



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,750	09/22/2003	David J. Lillie	03SW198/ALBRP318US	1899
7590	01/16/2007		EXAMINER	
Susan M. Donahue Rockwell Automation 704-P, IP Department 1201 South 2nd Street Milwaukee, WI 53204			STACE, BRENT S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/667,750	LILLIE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Brent S. Stace	2161	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 27 December 2006. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-39.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____


AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____


JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As to the applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1, 12, 21, 26, 33, and 34 for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching "the shared access profiles include customized access and/or administrative privileges to a networked device, and in the way provide users having similar roles with selective access to the networked device," the examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, as to the implied argument that Schaeck doesn't teach shared access profiles, the examiner submits that this is taught as originally cited in at least paragraphs [0022] and [0067]. Paragraph [0067] teaches that different roles for a user can exist in one profile in that the user can log in as either employee or admin. When they chose which one to log in to, a the user role is selected from a different (from the other role) user profile record. A different user profile record is not a different user profile. This is also taught in the other cited paragraph [0022] in that it explicitly teaches that "Preferably, the user role is stored in a user profile associated with the user, and the user role is determined using the user's identification credentials." Additionally, since users can have multiple roles (as taught in paragraph [0066]), the different roles are stored in different user profile records, not different user profiles (since paragraph [0022] teaches that roles are stored in the profile).

Second as to the argument that Schaeck does not teach that the shared profiles include customized access and or administrative privileges to a networked device, the examiner submits that this is taught as originally cited in at least paragraphs [0022] and [0067]. Specifically, paragraph [0067] teaches customized access with the employee role, and it teaches administrative privileges with the administrative role. Additionally, these roles correspond to access to a networked device (e.g. web server) since these roles are employed in web services (see paragraph [0064], or the mere title of Schaeck).

Finally, as to the argument that Schaeck does not teach that the roles/profiles allegedly do not provide users having similar roles with selective access to the networked device, the examiner submits that this is taught as originally cited in at least paragraphs [0022] and [0067]. The "selective access to the networked device" limitation was shown as being taught above with the different roles (e.g. employee role) to the web services networked device. As for the "users having similar roles" limitation, the examiner submits that this is taught as originally cited in at least paragraphs [0022] and [0067]. Specifically, paragraph [0067] teaches that a user can have an employee role. In order to meet the limitation, the reference must have multiple users having a similar role. Paragraph [0066] specifically teaches that a manager, for instance, will have employees. These employees will have their own employee role, thus meeting the limitation of "users having similar roles." Additionally, in showing that multiple users can have the same role, paragraph [0043] teaches "Users 220 who have the role consumer....".

There appears to be no more arguments to address.